REMARKS

Claims 1 - 7 are pending in the patent application, claims 8-20 have been withdrawn from consideration and claims 21 - 27 have been added by this amendment. A Request for Continued Examination has been filed and applicant hereby requests a three month extension of time.

Claims 1 - 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 112(1). In the Office Action of November 26, 2003, it is stated that the "specification, while being enabling for inhibiting T cell activation in vivo to the agonist peptide, does not reasonably provide enablement for inhibiting all T cell activation." There is also a reference to the Office Action of 1-13-2003 and the reasons stated therein. The Office Action of 1 - 13 - 2003 states that:

> As it is clearly demonstrated in Figure 9A and B in the specification, the Ig-PLP-LR construct caused T cell proliferation in vivo when T cells from mice injected with the construct were interacted with by the PLP-LR peptide. Since the construct caused stimulation of T cells to the antagonist peptide when an antagonist Ig construct was given in vivo, the full scope of the invention is not enabled.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that the teachings of the application do not enable the claimed invention. First, the claims do not require inhibition of "all T cells" but instead T cells "specific for said T cell receptor antagonist." Second, the specification has examples of inactivation of autoreactive T cells upon use of an Ig-antagonist (e.g., Ig-PLP-LR) as taught in the claims. Figures 9A - 9B and the accompanying Example XII demonstrate that the Ig-PLP-LR construct induces T cell proliferation. These antagonistic T cells, which should be functionally different from the agonist induced T cells, are expected to react with the agonist PLP-1 due to close structural similarity between the PLP-1 and PLP-LR peptides. However, proliferation indicates cell division while the Examiner is reading it as a function. It is the induction which determines function. The in vitro proliferation is a read out to say that a cell was induced *in vivo* but it does not predict the T cell's function. Thus applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are not enabled pursuant to 35 USC 112(1) and requests withdrawal of this rejection.

A Terminal Disclaimer will be filed under separate cover along with an IDS bringing to the attention of the Examiner other references.

If there are any questions, applicant's attorney can be reached at the number stated below.

Dated: 5/25/04

By: _____
John Wurst
Registration No. 40,283
(858) 410-5174